

1 I guess my time is about up, so I will
2 give you these.

3 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you,
4 Mr. Siemer. You still have a few moments, if you
5 want to take them.

6 I would remind folks that written
7 comments can be as long as you want. So, we're
8 not limiting in any way your ability to put in
9 the record your comments and concerns, we're just
10 limiting the oral comment period here.

11 Joe Marantette is next -- and I have a
12 question mark by Joe's name, suggesting he may or
13 may not want to comment -- followed by Lowell
14 Jobe.

15 MR. LOWELL JOBE: Jobe.

16 THE FACILITATOR: Jobe.

17 While Mr. Jobe's coming up, I will
18 identify for the record Exhibit 5, statement by
19 Representative Simpson's staff.

20 And then I have Exhibit 6, which is
21 several multi-page documents entitled, "Comments
22 on Draft INEEL HLW-EIS, Idaho High-Level Waste
23 and Facilities Disposition, to Tom Wichmann and
24 Ann Dold from Darryl Siemer." And that will be
25 Exhibit 6.

1 MR. LOWELL JOBE: My name is Lowell
2 Jobe, L-O-W-E-L-L, J-O-B-E. And I'm representing
3 Coalition 21.

4 My comments with regard to this, the
5 first one, seems to be partially, at least,
6 solved when I got here tonight and find that the
7 cost summary is on the table out there to be
8 seen.

9 But [the purpose of an EIS doesn't have
10 to include the effective costs; however,
11 cost-effective comparisons of the various
12 alternatives is or should be a major factor in
13 the public's, and also the DOE's, evaluations and
14 decisions. Environmental concerns are important,
15 but they are not the only important factors that
16 determine the best interests of our
17 United States.

18 Therefore, we, the public, need to know
19 when the cost and evaluations will be available.
20 And, hopefully, somebody can tell us when we
21 might expect to receive them. Now, such
22 information could very possibly narrow down the
23 alternatives worth considering.]

24 The second point is, [we are not totally
25 convinced that DOE supplied the National Resource

D-53

DOE/EIS-0287

1 Council Committee on INEEL with the sufficient
2 data for them to arrive at a more definitive
3 evaluation of all these different alternatives
4 for handling this high-level waste.]

3504-6
VII.D(i)

5 [To meet the Idaho Settlement's deadline,
6 it is easy to postpone decisions and actions
7 while waiting for better information, such as the
8 NRC requested, but such postponement does not get
9 things done. And it does sound as though DOE is
10 trying here to expedite those.]

3504-3
III.F.2(i)

11 Third, [we support the State of Idaho's
12 view that DOE's current method of calculating the
13 metric tons of heavy metal should be changed to
14 either of the State's proposed methods to allow
15 the DOE high-level waste to be within the
16 proposed repository's space allotment.]

3504-4
III.F.2(ii)

17 Fourth, [DOE should freeze the Waste
18 Acceptance Criteria without waiting for details
19 of the repositories. This would allow expediting
20 a decision on INEEL waste handling by eliminating
21 any bureaucratic procrastination.]

3504-5
VII.A(i)

22 And, fifth, [greater DOE emphasis on
23 public comment, input, should really be given to
24 recommendations and comments from the Citizen's
25 Advisory Board, who are selected to represent a

1 real cross-section of the public and who
2 intensively study the issues before making
3 consensus recommendations. Those of the public
4 who make comments have an obligation to really
5 study the issues and facts first, and base their
6 comments on those, rather than any emotions.]

7 And so, with that, I'll just say that
8 this is only the preliminary comments, and we
9 will have further ones in writing.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
11 comments.

12 MR. LOWELL JOBE: And I'll leave you
13 this.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, sir. All
15 right.

16 Well, as Exhibit No. 6, a one-page
17 document from Coalition 21 letterhead.

18 John Tanner is next, followed by Don
19 Beckman.

20 Did I say Exhibit 6? I meant Exhibit 7.

21 MR. JOHN TANNER: John Tanner, J-O-H-N,
22 T-A-N-N-E-R, from Idaho Falls, retired INEL
23 employee.

3505-1
III.D.1(i)

24 [I accept the statements made earlier
25 that any of the methods chosen to deal with our

1 high-level waste should not have significant
 2 environmental effects, with exception, of course,
 3 of the no-action alternative, where it would be
 4 very sloppy, to say the least, to leave the
 5 liquid waste in the tank until they finally,
 6 someday, leak.] And, also, having worked at the
 7 INEL, I believe there would be no more risk to
 8 workers from any of the methods than from any of
 9 the better industries around the country.
 10 [But I would like to give added
 11 encouragement to reasonable -- to calculating
 12 metric tons of heavy metal based on amount of
 13 radioactivity, rather than on waste volume. And
 14 the reason that this is more sensible is that
 15 it's amount of radioactivity that determines heat
 16 load, and heat load, in turn, limits -- is the
 17 limiting factor for packing density inside the
 18 repository.]
 19 [And the practical importance of this is
 20 that some important methods are, more or less,
 21 being ruled out on the basis of disposal costs
 22 because of -- they entail a higher volume, waste
 23 volume. And I'm talking specifically about the
 24 suggestion to grout the calcine instead of doing
 25 a separations method or instead of vitrifying

1 it.
 2 The cost document only was just released
 3 today, and they don't actually give the
 4 calculations for the cost, except by reference to
 5 other documents with which I'm not familiar.
 6 But I strongly suspect that the
 7 enormously higher disposal costs attributed to
 8 grouting the calcine is simply due to counting
 9 metric tons of heavy metal as calculated on waste
 10 volume, rather than radioactivity and, therefore,
 11 assuming that they will be packed in the
 12 repository a certain waste -- by a certain waste
 13 volume fraction instead of the maximum density
 14 that the radioactive heat load would permit.]
 15 Thank you.
 16 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
 17 comments.
 18 I would remind you, if you want to
 19 comment this evening, to register at the
 20 registration table just outside the door, and
 21 then I will get your name and call your name.
 22 And, also, there's a variety of ways, in addition
 23 to commenting verbally, that are available. And
 24 all those are identified and the items for doing
 25 so are available at the registration table.

1 I have Don Beckman.
2 MR. DON BECKMAN: I'm going to
3 relinquish my three minutes and submit it in
4 writing.
5 THE FACILITATOR: Are you Mr. Beckman?
6 MR. DON BECKMAN: Yes.
7 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you,
8 Mr. Beckman.
9 Karol Kay Hope.
10 MS. KAROL KAY HOPE: No. I'll
11 relinquish.
12 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Ms. Hope.
13 Harry Heiselman. Is Mr. Heiselman in
14 the room?
15 Let the record reflect that he didn't
16 come forward.
17 That concludes the list of folks who
18 have signed up to comment. We're going to be
19 here until ten o'clock, in the event that any of
20 you want to comment and gather your thoughts. In
21 the meantime, we will go off the record subject
22 to call of the chair -- or of the hearing
23 officer.
24 MR. DARRYL SIEMER: We go sign up again,
25 is that what we do?

1 THE FACILITATOR: No, sir. We're
2 allowing one opportunity for all commentors this
3 evening. And the purpose for that is to give
4 everyone equal opportunity to comment. We're not
5 always sure we're going to have fewer commentors
6 than time allotted. And, in terms of fairness, I
7 think it's -- we'll restrict you to one shot this
8 evening.
9 You do have plenty of additional shots,
10 though, however, by filing written comments or
11 through the other avenues that are available to
12 you.
13 So, we'll be off the record subject to
14 call of the hearing officer.
15 (A recess was taken.)
16 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. We'll be back
17 on the record.
18 This is a continuation of the
19 United States Department of Energy's Idaho
20 High-Level Waste and Facilities Disposition Draft
21 Environmental Impact Statement being held on
22 February 7 in Idaho Falls, Idaho.
23 After our break, we're back on the
24 record at 9:30. I note for the record that no
25 additional commentors have registered to comment

Document 35, Public Comment Hearing, February 7, 2000, Idaho Falls, ID
Page 21 of 21

1 this evening and would remind all the folks in
2 the audience that, if you would like to comment,
3 you can do so by March 20, 2000, by submitting
4 written comments, fax comments, Internet
5 comments, or by attending one of the other public
6 meetings being held throughout the region.

7 We did have one commentor who I called
8 earlier this evening who wasn't in the room when
9 I called him. We'll see if he's departed or if
10 he's here.

11 Joe Marantette.

12 I will note for the record that
13 Mr. Marantette is not here, and ask if there's
14 anyone else in the audience who has not yet had
15 an opportunity to do so but would like to comment
16 this evening on the Draft Environmental Impact
17 Statement.

18 I will note for the record that no one
19 has so indicated.

20 With that, we will close this evening's
21 hearing, and we'll resume tomorrow in Pocatello
22 at the Quality Inn --

23 MS. CAROL COLE: No. At Idaho State
24 University.

25 THE FACILITATOR: -- at Idaho State

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY
Page 1 of 54

HLW & FD EIS PROJECT ~~AR~~/PF
Control # NC-36

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING ON
IDAHO HIGH-LEVEL WASTE
AND FACILITIES DISPOSITION
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2000

SNOW KING RESORT
JACKSON HOLE, WYOMING

Reported by:
Kimberly Carpenter, CSR #600

EASTERN IDAHO COURT REPORTERS
P. O. Box 50853
Idaho Falls, ID 83405
(208) 529-0222